

points to another doubling in the next 10 years.

One of the most important factors which contributed to the growth and success of REA was when the Congress stabilized the interest rate on REA loans. This enabled directors of the rural electric systems to plan ahead the development of additional sections on an area coverage basis—making service available to all who wanted it without regard to the distance from existing lines. It made it possible to stabilize the investment cost of one section with another and to encourage the support of those fortunate to receive service on the earlier sections to extend it to others.

By setting uniform engineering standards to get construction at the lowest possible cost, by standardizing the investment costs, and by taking advantage of all possible sources of wholesale power supply, REA was able with the dedicated help of thousands of local directors and managers to reach the great goal of this program—universal availability of service.

There still remains the continuing objective of REA borrowers in Texas to provide service with rates and conditions more comparable to those available in the more densely populated urban areas.

We in Texas are also proud of the contribution my colleague, the Honorable Bob Poage, has made toward creating the REA telephone loan program, a program which is proving extremely important to the economic growth of our State as well as contributing to the convenience, safety, and health of our citizens.

In 1949 when this additional program was authorized, about 24 percent of the farms and ranches in Texas had telephones. Of these, most were the obsolete magneto or common battery variety. Today 70 percent have modern telephone service financed in large part through the help of REA loans. Four hundred and seven new automatic dial exchanges connect rural people not only with one another but with their sons wherever stationed around the world should the occasion arise.

Alas, not all the men associated with these great programs have lived to see and enjoy their success. There was Deputy Administrator of REA, George W. Haggard, who, before coming to his national post, served as the first editor of the Texas statewide association publication, Texas Co-op Power. On June 30, 1951 he was killed in an airplane crash in Colorado while on duty with five other REA officials. In his memory the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has established the George W. Haggard Award for excellence in journalism among the 29 State associations now publishing monthly magazines.

This year the present Texas editor, Bill Lewis, was selected by his peers to receive this award.

Two of our electric cooperative managers have been chosen to head NRECA, the national trade association representing nearly 1,000 member systems which have joined together to provide services for REA borrowers which the govern-

ment does not provide and which they cannot do as well for themselves. They were Tom Craddock, manager of the B-K Electric Cooperative at Seymour, Tex., and Ray Yarborough, manager of the Fort Belknap Electric Cooperative at Olney, Tex.

As we salute the Rural Electrification Administration on the occasion of its 30th anniversary and pay tribute to its outstanding record, we need to keep in mind that 10 percent of the population of this country depends on this program for their electric service; that they live in over half the land area of the Nation, and that they are doubling their consumption of electricity every 8 to 10 years. So long as the consumers themselves have shown they are capable of managing their systems without personal monetary gain to themselves; so long as their elected directors and their managers and staff continue to give them the best electric service possible, it remains the responsibility of the Congress not to handicap them with undue restrictions on their ability to continue their record of service.

We in Texas are proud of our contributions to the success of rural electrification and telephone service through the REA program and we join with millions throughout the land in praising a job well done.

BILL TO PERMIT CHECKING ACCOUNT SERVICES BY FEDERALLY CHARTERED THRIFT INSTITUTIONS

(Mr. PATMAN was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to enable federally chartered thrift institutions to afford checking account services to their patrons by accepting demand deposits on a limited basis. My bill would thus enable Federal savings and loan associations and Federal credit unions to greatly improve their services and usefulness to the American public.

At present these institutions are permitted to accept only share or savings accounts. My bill would allow them to accept demand deposits on a 100-percent reserve basis. This means that these institutions could not lend out this money on a fractional reserve basis, and thus could not create money as our commercial banks are permitted to do. The demand deposit funds received would be required to be 100 percent in cash or the equivalent of cash, such as short-term Government securities. These institutions would also be permitted to pay a reasonable interest rate on these deposits.

Good arguments against such a limited checking account authority are hard to come by in my book. There would be no detrimental effect on the operation of our monetary system. Like it or not, the Federal Reserve Board would still have control over the supply of money and over interest rates just as they do now. The lending powers of these thrift institutions would not be

expanded at all, and the sole benefit would be to the public. This bill makes it more attractive for Americans to save.

So, enactment of this bill can only strengthen our Nation's financial and economic condition, and it will be to the definite benefit of the average citizen. Our free enterprise system must be allowed to function in each and every industry—free enterprise thrives on competition.

My bill specifically provides that any State-chartered thrift institution which may accept demand deposits under State law may enjoy the same privileges under this bill as federally chartered institutions. The bill is as follows:

H.R. 8199

A bill to permit Federal savings and loan associations and Federal credit unions to afford checking account services to their patrons by accepting demand deposits on a 100 percent reserve basis, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first paragraph (12 U.S.C. 342) of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by inserting "savings bank, savings and loan association, or credit union" immediately after "nonmember bank or trust company" both times it appears therein.

Sec. 2. Section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) Any Federal savings and loan association may accept deposits subject to withdrawal on demand, including deposits of its own funds, and may honor requests for withdrawal of such deposits in the form of checks and drafts. Any association which accepts demand deposits pursuant to this subsection shall at all times maintain reserves, in addition to any other reserves held or maintained by it, at least equal to the full amount of such deposits. Such reserves shall be held in one or more of the following forms:

"(1) Demand deposits in one or more Federal home loan banks.

"(2) Demand deposits in one or more Federal Reserve banks.

"(3) Demand deposits fully insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in one or more commercial banks.

"(4) Marketable securities having not more than five years to run to maturity, issued or guaranteed by the United States.

"(5) Items in transit, as defined by the Board, to the extent that demand deposits in the association are increased by such items.

"(6) Coins and currency of the United States."

Sec. 3. Section 5(b) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464(b)) is amended by changing "No deposits shall be accepted and no" to read "Except as provided in subsection (m), no deposits shall be accepted. No".

Sec. 4. Section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended (1) by inserting "Federal Reserve banks and" immediately after "(S) to make deposits in"; (2) by redesignating paragraph (13) thereof as paragraph (14), and (3) by inserting, immediately after paragraph (12) thereof, the following new paragraph:

"(13) to accept from its members and from its own funds deposits payable on demand, and to honor requests for withdrawal of such deposits in the form of checks and drafts."

Sec. 5. Section 17 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1762) is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec.

May 20, 1965

17." and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any Federal credit union which accepts demand deposits pursuant to section 8(13) shall at all times maintain reserves, in addition to any other reserves held or maintained by it, at least equal to the full amount of such deposits. Such reserves shall be held in one or more of the following forms:

"(1) Demand deposits in one or more Federal Reserve banks.

"(2) Demand deposits fully insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in one or more commercial banks.

"(3) Items in transit, as defined by the Director, to the extent that demand deposits in the association are increased by such items.

"(4) Marketable securities having not more than five years to run to maturity, issued or guaranteed by the United States.

"(5) Coins and currency of the United States."

STRYCKER'S BAY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL'S STATEMENT ON HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee has recently reported out the administration's Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and we will soon be debating this vitally important measure on the floor of the House. I have a deep interest in this subject. When I testified before the committee concerning this year's housing bill, I pointed out, among other things, that the bill did not adequately meet the tremendous need for low- and middle-income housing in New York City. I will discuss this issue when the bill comes before us. But I do want to draw the attention of the House to a statement on the bill by the Strycker's Bay Neighborhood Council.

Strycker's Bay Neighborhood Council is an organization comprising delegates and individual members from over 50 institutions and organizations within and around the 20 square blocks in the West Side urban renewal area. Strycker's Bay, which has been functioning in the community since 1959, is an outstanding community organization which has been most active in the housing field. Father Henry J. Browne, the president, has provided extraordinary leadership in developing this new concept of citizen participation.

Mr. Speaker, the following statement emphasizes the need for low- and middle-income housing. It also points out the difficulty community groups have in making their views known to housing and local government officials. I urge all my colleagues to read this enlightening and important statement:

STATEMENT ON FEDERAL HOUSING BILL OF 1965 FROM STRYCKER'S BAY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL, NEW YORK, N.Y.

The Strycker's Bay Neighborhood Council, an organization of delegates and individual members from over 50 institutions and organizations from within and around the 20 square blocks of the West Side urban renewal area, has been functioning as a unified voice

as early as 1961. It made a statement on the proposed housing bill and, indeed, on the complicated matter of Federal land appraisal practice which at that time was not helping to make middle-income housing (in a realistic sense) possible in our neighborhood. Again in 1964 we made a fuller statement based on our experience of 5 years with urban renewal and emphasized the essential connection between the need for public housing, and the continuance of urban renewal. We feel not only alone but almost singular as we look through the hearings of congressional subcommittees on housing and find no curbstone voices raised but only special interest groups, even if some of those are raised in defense of the voiceless city tenants; a small section of whom we think we more directly represent.

As the people's voice in an urban renewal area we have come to the conclusion that the citizens' participation section of the Federal urban renewal law is constantly being made a mockery of by local public agencies and this with the connivance of the regional Housing and Home Finance Agency office. The local policy agency tends to make the participating citizens only those agreeing with them. We have had to force our voice to be heard and have not been able to have our activities financed out of project costs since 1961 even though our program fulfills perfectly the description of citizens' participation as found in the Federal manual. We think that what we have attempted with bootstrap financing has been a foreshadowing of what is described as required in the Economic Opportunities Act; namely, the participation of the people affected in any program that will be introduced into their neighborhood. We feel a world of difference exists between the execution of citizens' participation in urban renewal and the philosophy of involvement of the poor themselves in the anti-poverty program. It seems very strange to us to find such conflicting approaches in programs proposed by the same administration. If the poor are to have voice in their own destiny there is nothing that affects them more drastically than their housing, and it is there most of all that others are allowed to speak, supposedly in their interest.

Our interest has been expressed mostly in terms of the needs of those dislocated by urban renewal, therefore, of low and low-middle income families, by New York City standards those below \$8,000. The well-designed and scattered vest pocket public housing that our dislocated tenants are having made available for them in their old community is something that we are proud to have had a major share in helping our city to achieve. We are afraid, however, that the Federal allowance per dwelling unit is not allowing our city's housing authority to provide for the larger families, where the housing need is greatest. We fear too, as we know our municipal leaders have pointed out to you, that the figure of 35,000 new units for the whole country in new low rental construction with only 16 percent allowed to any 1 State (and particularly where leasing or rehabilitating an equal amount may not be so feasible) is grossly inadequate. We have had our differences with the New York Housing Authority but never on the matter of their haste in building all they were ever allowed. Since New York City carries a greater burden for the rest of the country than is appreciated not only as a port of entry but as headquarters for much nationwide activity, should it not be enabled to pick up the unused quota in public housing from other cities? The present proposal, again in the light of an all-out drive on poverty, is much less than a heroic approach and in fact is patently absurd.

This brings us to the much heralded rent supplement plan. We understand that it was the real estate lobby's approach to house

the poor advanced over 30 years. We respect the fears of the experts of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials that twice as many poor could be housed in traditional public housing as rent supplements could care for with the same amount of money. We wonder what impact it can have on New York City when the Federal Administrator, our old neighbor and friend, Dr. Robert Weaver, speaks of 90 percent of those to be housed in this fashion as falling between the \$3,000 and \$5,000 income families, when such families as these would be lucky to be making enough to qualify for regular public housing in our city. As a matter of sad fact, there is no program even advanced that will decently house the 25 percent of our city's households which now can be scientifically called poor. We are not too concerned with seeing the real estate developers getting subsidized at both the building and renting end. A stable low interest rate, plus tax abatement, on the as yet really untried (for our area) program, seems to us a more feasible even if very partial answer to the need to experiment in housing the not as poor poor. Meanwhile even cheaper public housing in civilized-sized developments scattered throughout economically mixed communities we feel is the much more essential need.

We feel a particular need and obligation to speak on urban renewal since it is happening to us and our neighbors. We have no delusions that unassisted private enterprise would or could do renewal of a neighborhood with as much regard for its continuing life as does a local government. Yet what we have to deal with and live under is a bureaucracy on two and sometimes three levels of government. The impact of this is not only to make any progress a minor miracle on New York's West Side but also to create such inconveniences for residential tenants in city-owned buildings, slated to stand for several years, as unpainted hallways. Administrative manuals seem to us ordinary citizens to be used not as stepping stones but as stumbling blocks. On the other hand, the freedom given to developers under government-aided programs impresses us as an area wherein some regulation might be in order. Luxuriously designed buildings and those with high percentages of studio apartments are allowed to be planned with no regard to the future character of the community but only to supposedly rigid laws of market analysis.

We ask for an urban renewal law and administration that will allow a maximum of real citizen's involvement and more local responsibility and power, but at the same time a kind of planning that will be less for developers' profits and more for wholesome future city living.

LET'S DISARM THE CRIMINAL—NOT THE LAW-ABIDING CITIZEN

(Mr. CASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it is the criminal—not the 40 million law-abiding gun owners in our Nation—causing our gravest domestic problem.

The problem is the illegal use of firearms by the criminal. It is compounded by lax enforcement and prosecution of existing laws, and uncalled for leniency by judges in the sentence meted to not only first offenders but repeat offenders as well.

A parade of witnesses in the other body are now attempting to stampede this Congress into passing legislation to create a morass of red tape through which

May 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

Approved For Release 2004/05/05 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500280021-4

the law-abiding citizen must wade, and ignoring completely any effort to strike at the criminal.

This Congress is being urged to legislate on the basis of emotion, half-truths, and fuzzy facts, and I urge my colleagues to take a long, hard look at these proposals, and examine closely the very nature of our crime problem and what little effect some of the proposals would have in solving it.

A few weeks ago, I introduced two bills, H.R. 5641 and 5642, to set a mandatory 25-year Federal penal sentence for the use or possession of a firearm during the commission of the crime of robbery, rape, murder, homicide—other than involuntary manslaughter—assault and kidnapping. Thousands of persons from every State has deluged me, and so I have been told, my colleagues, with letters in support of this approach. The first bill applies only to the District of Columbia, and if you think there is no need to take the discretion of sentencing armed criminals from the hands of the local judges, then I direct your attention to the crime statistics I will submit.

The second bill applies to the Nation, and the leverage to give the Federal Government authority is the interstate commerce clause. Some of my colleagues have expressed doubt that the Federal Government can act in this area generally reserved to the jurisdiction of the States.

But I tell you now, if this Congress can set the wages a businessman must pay because he sells a can of beans that moved in Interstate commerce, then it has the authority and the duty to protect that businessman from the illegal use of a firearm that moved in interstate commerce.

Mr. Speaker, it is the repeat offender who has found through court leniency that it is profitable to prey on society that I am after. If there is any doubt about the need to remove these parasites, let us look at the crime rate within the District of Columbia:

During February 1965, there were 144 robberies reported. Out of 70 persons eventually charged for these offenses, 40 had prior criminal records.

There were 36 assault with deadly weapon offenses reported. Out of the 26 arrested, 25 had prior criminal records.

There were four homicides reported. Two persons eventually arrested had prior criminal records.

Does this tell the whole story? Absolutely not.

Ask any police department, including our own Federal Bureau of Investigation, how many criminals arrested had stolen weapons in their possession. They cannot tell you. Such information is not kept.

Let us look at the prosecution of criminals here in the District of Columbia, for I know a number of my colleagues share my own feeling of disgust every time we read of an habitual criminal being turned loose to continue a career in crime.

In the District Code, there is a section 22-3202, permitting the filing of a charge

for stiff additional penalties for use of firearms in commission of a crime. Were any such charges filed against the 40 repeat offenders arrested in February for robbery? No.

I wrote the U.S. attorney demanding to know why no charges are being filed under section 22-3202 of the law. I draw your attention to my letter, and his reply, for this gentleman must share part of the burden for the heavy increase in crime in the District. It is his responsibility to prosecute to the limits of the law, and in my opinion, he is not fulfilling his responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues now that vigorous prosecution, and stiffer sentencing by the courts, will go far to solve the crime problem in the District of Columbia and in the respective States.

In the month of March, robberies in the District were up 123 percent over a year ago, and housebreaking 150 percent, and for all crime, up 285 percent. In April, robberies were up 155 percent over the preceding April, and housebreaking 188 percent, and for all crime, up 607 percent.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, our own great expert on crime, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, struck out at the laxity of the courts in granting leniency to hardened criminals. I call my colleagues' attention to his message, which stated in part:

Files of police departments in every State are filled with scores of cases where innocent members of society paid dearly for the inept use of leniency in some form by parole and probation authorities. A case in California typifies the havoc which can result from the granting of unrealistic judicial leniency. Two hardened ex-convicts savagely murdered a Los Angeles police officer after kidnapping the slain officer and his partner. The murdered officer was shot by both criminals as he stood with his hands over his head. One shot him in the mouth, while the other fired four more shots into the officer as he lay dying on the ground. Both of these murderers were on parole at the time of this crime and had received leniency in the form of conditional release, parole, or probation a total of eight times. One's criminal record included arrests for Interstate transportation of a stolen motor vehicle, parole violation, escape from a Federal institution, statutory rape, suspicion of burglary, grand theft, possession of narcotics, and a vagrancy law charge. He escaped from confinement in connection with one of his prison sentences and violated conditions of his release on two other occasions. The other criminal had been arrested on 17 different occasions for auto burglary, petty theft, and numerous violations of narcotics and burglary laws. He, too, had escaped confinement on one occasion and received probation or parole on several occasions.

In another instance, an individual was indicted by a grand jury in 1962 on nine counts of rape, assault, and robbery. This law-breaker had been in trouble since 1950, and he had been selected as a fit subject for parole or probation on three occasions during his criminal career. While on probation in 1953, he was accused of two assaults on women. Released in 1955, he was arrested again within 2 months on two counts of assault involving women, a "peeping-tom" violation, and unauthorized use of an automobile. Incarcerated again, he was once more deemed a good "selection" and was turned loose on society in 1958. Picked up in less

than 6 months, this individual was charged with grand larceny and then released once more in 1962. Five months after this last act of leniency, he resumed his criminal activities. Within 2 months during the summer of 1962, he raped one woman at knife-point, stabbed another nine times as she knelt in prayer in a church, raped a 60-year-old housewife at knife point, and committed his third rape against a 54-year-old woman he trapped in an elevator.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation can provide additional facts which indicate that far too many selections for parole and probation are being made blindly. Of the 14 special agents killed in gun battles, 12 were slain by criminals who had been previously selected for parole, probation or other types of leniency. Furthermore, of the 202 fugitives who have appeared on the FBI's list of "The Ten Most Wanted Fugitives" since the beginning of this program in March 1950, 167 have been the recipient of some type of leniency. As of November 1, 1964, the FBI Identification Division had wanted notices on 79,756 individuals. Of these, 21,546 were wanted for parole violation and 6,022 were being sought for probation violations.

These are frightening statistics—and passage of the Casey bills would remove these vultures from where they can prey on the innocent for 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues agree that my bill can disarm the criminal without harassing legitimate gun owners and gun businesses, and I am gratified that they have introduced companion bills. I earnestly believe that through our efforts, we can focus the attention of Congress back into the area causing the problem—the criminal use of firearms.

I ask my colleagues to look at a sample of the reaction I have received from their own constituents, and if in their judgment, my bill merits consideration to join in introducing similar legislation:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., March 9, 1965

DAVID C. ACHESON,
U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia,
U.S. Courthouse, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: I would like to have, as soon as possible, the following information concerning prosecution of criminals within the District of Columbia:

1. The number of persons charged with armed robbery during 1964.
2. How many of those were second, third or fourth offenders.
3. What was the minimum and the maximum sentence given to repeat offenders.
4. How many times was additional punishment sought under section 22-3202 providing additional punishment for persons committing a crime of violence when armed with a pistol or other firearm.

5. If no effort was made to prosecute under Section 22-3202, I would like to have your explanation as to the reason it was not.

Respectfully,

BOB CASEY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

OFFICE OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY,

Washington, D.C., March 30, 1965.

HON. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: Referring to your letter of March 9, in which you ask for data on indictments for armed robbery in the District of Columbia, I had hoped to be able to furnish you the information before this,

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 280021 HOUSE

May 20, 1965

but found that the job involved a review of each criminal jacket in a very substantial number of cases, more than I had anticipated. In addition, the work had to be supervised by the lawyer in charge of my grand jury section, who of course, is almost totally preoccupied with his regular grand jury duties, with the result that he could only allocate a small part of each day to screening the criminal jackets. The result is a greater delay in the schedule than I had hoped, but I think the information will be useful to you nonetheless.

Your first three questions are answered in the statistical data set forth below:

Number of robbery indictments during 1964	218
Number of counts	554
Number of separate incidents alleged	236
Number of defendants	331
Number of defendants with prior felony convictions	125
Number of robbery indictments alleging use of real firearms	96
Number of armed robbery indictments	143
Number of counts in armed robbery indictments	449
Number of separate incidents alleged in armed robbery indictments	167
Number of defendants in armed robbery indictments	235
Number of defendants in armed robbery indictments with prior felony convictions	92
Total number of defendants sentenced in all robbery cases	177
Number of defendants sentenced under provisions of the Federal Youth Corrections Act	39
Number of defendants receiving maximum sentences of 5-15 years	13
Number of defendants receiving 5-15 years who had prior felony records	9

With regard to all robbery indictments in which sentences have been imposed, defendants with prior felony convictions were sentenced as follows. The sentences marked with asterisks indicate armed robbery: From 5 to 15 years*; 5 to 15 years*; 3 months*; 2 to 8 years*; 2 to 6 years*; 3 to 10 years*; 5 to 15 years; 6 months; 4 to 12 years*; 3 to 9 years*; 1 to 5 years; 5 to 15 years*; 5 to 15 years*; 4 to 19 years*; 1 to 3 years*; 1 to 3 years; 8 to 18 months; 2 to 8 years*; 2 to 6 years; 2 to 6 years*.

From 2 to 6 years*; 2 to 8 years; 8 to 24 months; 3 to 12 years*; 3 years probation; 5 to 15 years*; 5 to 15 years*; 1 to 3 years*; 5 to 15 years*; 4 to 12 years*; 3 to 9 years*; 18 months; 32 months to 8 years*; 32 months to 8 years*; 3 to 120 months*; 1 to 5 years; 2 to 7 years; 3 to 10 years; 3 to 9 years*; 3 years probation.

From 1 to 4 years; 1 to 3 years*; F.Y.C.A.*; 5 to 15 years*; 4 to 12 years*; 8 to 20 months; 8 to 20 months; 1 to 4 years; 1 to 5 years; 1 to 4 years; 16 months to 5 years*; 3 to 9 years*; F.Y.C.A.; 20 months to 80 months*; 2 to 0 years*; 2 to 7 years; 1 to 3 years; 3 to 9 years*; 2 to 7 years*.

I have not attempted to break down the weapons involved in the armed robberies. They range from pistols to sharpened coat-hangers and even to unidentified "hard, sharp objects" with which the victim was cut but no weapon recovered when the case was closed.

In answer to your fourth question, District of Columbia Code, section 22-3202, was not invoked during 1964.

In answer to your fifth question, section 3202 was not used because it is not applicable to the crime of robbery. It is applicable to commissions of "a crime of violence." That phrase is defined in section 3201 as any of a number of particular crimes, namely: "Murder, manslaughter, rape, mayhem, maliciously disfiguring another, abduction, kidnapping, burglary, housebreaking, larceny, any assault with intent to kill, commit rape, or robbery, assault with a dangerous weapon,

or assault with intent to commit any offense punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary." The crime of robbery was omitted from the definition of crime of violence, possibly by inadvertence. The Government has at various times considered whether section 3202 could not be used in a robbery case anyway, on the theory that a robbery includes the crime of assault with intent to commit robbery, and that section 3202 may be applied to the latter crime. The fact, however, that robbery is so obviously omitted from the definition has been an impediment to attempting a technically logical argument that every robbery is also an assault with intent to commit robbery. In addition, on the occasions when predecessors of mine have attempted to apply the statute to a robbery, the reception to this proposal by the trial judge has given further discouragement.

With regard to crimes of violence as a whole, we have not attempted a definitive statistical analysis, since the burden of doing so would be unmanageable. Our experience, however, is that the maximum sentence, where the evidence shows that the crime was committed while armed with a firearm, is not imposed with sufficient regularity to warrant a belief that the sentence would be even greater if the additional charges were made under section 3202. In other words, the cases are very, very numerous in which the evidence shows that a gun was used and the sentencing Judge has still not imposed the maximum sentence. In these circumstances, there is no reason to believe that the sentence would be greater if the indictment recited, under section 3202, facts which the evidence shows in any case.

Perhaps one final point is relevant. It is the fixed policy of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia that the prosecutor may not seek any sentence in particular; that is, he may not make a recommendation to the court as to what sentence should be imposed or whether it should be greater or less than the recommendation of the Probation Office. The phrasing of your question No. 4 suggests that you might have been unaware of that policy of the court, which is the policy in by far the great majority of all of the Federal district courts.

In this connection, you might be interested in figures which were furnished to me by the Federal Bureau of Prisons in 1963, comparing District of Columbia sentences with the average sentences actually served in State institutions. The Bureau prepared these figures on a one-shot basis for the year 1940 for the crime of robbery. The average time served in months under District of Columbia sentences was 50.6 months. The average time served in State institutions for robbery was 42.3 months. The number of State offenders figured into the average is, of course, a great many times more numerous than the number of offenders figured into the District of Columbia average (96 District of Columbia prisoners, 6,819 State prisoners).

Sincerely yours,
DAVID C. ACHESON,
U.S. Attorney.

MASSACHUSETTS ALLIANCE OF
SALTWATER SPORTSMEN,
Burlington, Mass., April 16, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: Although we are considered a saltwater sportsmen's organization as our title indicates, there are many within our ranks whose outdoor recreation spans that of gun owner and hunter. Therefore, we are writing in support of H.R. 5642 which we understand you introduced and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

We represent some 20,000 sportsmen across our Commonwealth and at our monthly meeting on last April 14, 1965, a unanimous vote was recorded to favor H.R. 5642.

written. We believe that this legislation places the penalty rightfully where it belongs, on the criminal, without putting the useless burden of registration or ineffective licensing schemes on the law-abiding citizen.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM K. TURNER, Secretary.

FARFIELD, CONN.,
March 21, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: As the president of the Nutmeg Sportsmen here in the State of Connecticut, I wish to offer my congratulations and those of my fellow sportsmen, for the first truly sensible bill offered to Congress which, instead of harassing law-abiding lovers of the shooting sports, places the issue squarely upon the illegal or criminal individual.

It is only through the great foresight and level thinking of Representatives of the people such as yourself that our right to enjoy the ownership of guns will be protected in our Congress.

I for one, and all I can influence will do all in our power to write our own Representatives to endorse and approve bill H.R. 4651.

Very truly yours,
IRVING E. TAFFEL.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
GAME, FISH, AND CONSERVATION
COMMISSIONERS,
Sacramento, Calif., April 10, 1965.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: Permit me to congratulate you upon your simple, forthright approach to the firearms control problem, as demonstrated in your H.R. 5641.

This approach is most comforting to the many, many thousands of us firearms users who have been disturbed by the numerous proposals pending in Congress and the various State legislatures since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

We are glad to know there are still some cool heads in Congress who have the courage to get right to the kernel in the nut. Punish the criminal's use of firearms, and let honest citizens alone.

Sincerely,
SETH GORDON.

OUTDOOR WRITERS' ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Columbia, Mo., March 22, 1965.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Louisiana Wildlife Federation meeting in annual convention during the past weekend adopted resolutions strongly backing the bills you have introduced in Congress and strongly opposing gun laws which would be restrictive to the ordinary citizen.

Luckily, since they have rules stating that resolutions must be introduced 30 days prior to the convention, I was able to get a suspension of the rules to get the resolution supporting your efforts before the delegates.

Please feel free to call upon me for any help that I might be able to give you.

Sincerely yours,
HURLEY CAMPBELL,
Vice President.

THE NORTH CAROLINA
WILDLIFE FEDERATION, INC.,
Rocky Mount, N.C., March 29, 1965.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: For some time we have been pointing out to our membership that

May 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

10771

Approved For Release 2004/05/05 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500280021-4

It is not the ownership of firearms which constitutes the crime but the illegal use of such arms. We have often illustrated this point by stating that it was possible to easily kill someone with a heavy glass ash tray or most any other object normally at hand and that it would be, of course, ridiculous to outlaw the ownership of such items but that the criminal use of any weapon should be the subject of legislation rather than the ownership.

With the above in mind, we would heartily support your bill, H.R. 5642, and would request that we be kept informed as to its progress and how we may be of assistance in its enactment.

Sincerely,

TURNER W. HATTE,
Executive Director.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
PENNSYLVANIA GAME COMMISSION,
Harrisburg, Pa., March 29, 1965.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: Thank you for your letter concerning your firearms bills. It is gratifying to know that there are clear thinking individuals like you in our Congress. Unfortunately, not enough of your associates are as informed about this vital matter as you.

With the above in mind, I shall certainly solicit the support of your bill from our own Pennsylvania representatives.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated and we will do all we can to pass H.R. 5642.

Sincerely,

GEORGE H. HARRISON,

SPORT FISHING INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT CASEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: The Sport Fishing Institute would like to go on record as favoring your measure, H.R. 5641, as introduced March 2, 1965, concerning amendments to the Federal Firearms Act and the National Firearms Act. We approve of the philosophy and objectives of your proposed legislation, and would appreciate this letter being included in the record of written testimony, should public hearings be held.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. DOUGLAS,
Executive Secretary.

COLORADO WILDLIFE FEDERATION, INC.,
Wheat Ridge, Colo., March 19, 1965.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: Thank you for copy of your bill, H.R. 5642. This is the first sensible bill on firearms that has been introduced in Congress. I have long preached that we should legislate against the criminal instead of against the lawful citizen, and this bill does just that. One other bill along the same lines should be introduced, and that is a bill to provide severe penalties for anyone who has been convicted of a crime for mere possession of a gun. This would disarm the criminal and would give the police methods of taking guns away from the criminals. I would make the penalty at least 25 years in prison.

Thank you for taking action along this line. I wrote Senator Allott, who is on the Dodd bill, S. 14, and suggested he take a look at your bill.

Very truly yours,

A. J. CHRISTIANSEN, President.

STATE OF ARKANSAS
GAME AND FISH COMMISSION,
Little Rock, Ark., March 19, 1965.
Representative BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CASEY: I appreciate your letter of March 15 and wish to advise that I will encourage Arkansas representation to support H.R. 5642.

Sincerely,

GUS ALBRIGHT,
News Editor.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1965.
Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: I sincerely appreciate your recent letter regarding the problem of gun restriction and registration.

It is my personal opinion that H.R. 5642 should be incorporated in our Federal statutes even though other legislation may pass on firearm restriction and registration.

There is no question that your approach gets right at the heart of the real problem. I sincerely appreciate your calling this directly to my attention and we will do what we can on informing many of our colleagues.

Sincerely,

RUSS J. NEUGEBAUER,
Assistant Chief, Division of
Conservation Education.

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1965.
Hon. ROBERT CASEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: Thank you for sending me a copy of H.R. 5642 which would place the penalty for misuse of firearms on criminals and others rather than on the Nation's law-abiding firearms owners.

Your recommendation is entirely compatible with the views of sportsmen's organizations throughout the country. This institute took a similar position when it testified on an earlier antifirearms bill before the Senate Commerce Committee early last year. Your leadership in this regard is appreciated, and I am sure that you can count on considerable support for your viewpoints, should firearms legislation be considered in this Congress.

Sincerely,

DANIEL A. POOLE,
Secretary.

CLINTON, TENN.,
April 8, 1965.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: I am enclosing the resolution by the Tennessee Outdoor Writers Association, adopted on March 27, 1965, in our annual spring meeting, supporting your bills, H.R. 5641 and H.R. 5642.

I felt that you would know where to present the resolution so that it would do the most good. There were about 60 writers present at that meeting and they were eager to support it.

Our Southeastern Outdoor Press Association (SEOPA), a regional outdoor writers group of which I am president, does not meet until August. There are about 75 members in SEOPA and I know they also will want to adopt this resolution, but the meeting probably won't be soon enough to help the bills. Our executive board is scattered all over the southeast and this makes it difficult to get official action except at meeting time.

I hope we have good luck with the bills and if there is any further way we can be of service, just let me know. I'm going to urge each member to write to their Representatives and Senators through our newsletter which I will mail in about 2 weeks.

Sincerely yours,

TOM ROLLINS,
Secretary Treasurer,
Tennessee Outdoor Writers Association.

RESOLUTION OF ENDORSEMENT H.R. 5641 AND
H.R. 5642, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the vast majority of owners of firearms are peaceful, law-abiding citizens using their arms for sport; and

Whereas the greater number of firearms control bills introduced to law-making bodies are, in effect, antigun bills germinated in hysteria and based on misinformation, ignorance and expediency, tending not to punish the criminal but only to share his guilt with legitimate gun owners everywhere;

Whereas such bills are admittedly unenforceable in the criminal element, for registered firearms will be stolen and used in crime, criminals will smuggle and manufacture illegal firearms, and courts retain the power to turn loose on society the second and third offenders to continue preying on our citizens; and

Whereas Representative CASEY's bills place the crime on the purveyor, rather than the instrument, leaves the courts no discretion in sentencing the guilty, and are initiated on wisdom and farsightedness; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Tennessee Outdoor Writers Association, meeting in regular session at Montgomery Bell State Park near Dickson, Tenn., on March 27, 1965, That the Congress of the United States, now in session, speedily approve bills H.R. 5641 and H.R. 5642; and be it further

Resolved, That Federal firearm registration be prohibited, thereby bringing to an end the harassment of law-abiding recreational shooters and legitimate gun collectors.

Boa Witt,
President.
TOM ROLLINS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Glenview, Ill., March 23, 1965.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: Thanks for your letter of March 18 enclosing a copy of your bill, H.R. 5642, sent me as a member of O.W.A.A.

We in the Izaak Walton League also support strong legislation to curb the use of firearms by the criminal and command you for the positive position you are taking. We'll be happy to work with you on this.

Cordially,

J. W. PENFOLD,
Conservation Director.

MISSOURI CONSERVATION COMMISSION,
Jefferson City, Mo., March 22, 1965.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: Thank you for your letter of March 18 in which you enclosed a copy of your bill, H.R. 5642, making it a mandatory imprisonment of 25 years for the use of any firearm in major felony cases.

It is my opinion that you are approaching this firearm problem from the right point of view by attempting to control the criminal rather than the weapon. As a wildlife administrator I have been quite concerned about the numerous bills that would impose

May 20, 1965

a hardship upon the sportsmen and law-abiding citizens through the control of firearms, possession, and transportation. Such an approach would make all of us suffer because of the abuses of a few. No matter what controls we impose upon firearms, they are still going to get in the hands of criminals. The only real solution is to discourage their illegal use.

As a conservationist and a wildlife administrator, I will support your bill. There may be some legal aspects of the mandatory 25-year imprisonment sentence of which I am not aware, but I certainly agree with you in principle that it is the criminal that needs the control and not the weapon.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
Director.

CARLISLE GUN CLUB, INC.,
Carlisle, Pa., March 29, 1965.

HON. ROBERT R. CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: We would like to go on record as being in favor of your bill H.R. 5642 of March 2, 1965, as presently written.

David K. Bowers, Mechanicsburg, Pa., age 48.

George Stupi, Jr., Camp Hill, Pa., age 30.
Leonard C. Cole, Carlisle, Pa., age 32.

Marilyn Dickson, Carlisle, Pa., age 29.
Richard Dickson, Carlisle, Pa., age 33.

E. W. Hagenbuch, Mechanicsburg, Pa., age 36.

Michael E. Hornberger, Plainfield, Pa., age 28.

Wm. A. Duval, Carlisle, Pa., age 61.
Raymond F. Bear, Carlisle, Pa., age 42.

Clyde O. McKinney, Sr., Carlisle, Pa., age 62.

Robert E. Baker, Carlisle, Pa., age 43.
Guy B. Mullen, Jr., Mount Holly Springs, Pa., age 37.

Sam Caronigil, Mount Holly Springs, Pa., age 35.

Robert S. Clark, Mechanicsburg, Pa., age 37.

Curt Hormak, Carlisle, Pa., age 61.
Joe F. Stewart, Carlisle, Pa., age 46.

Robert S. Clark, Mechanicsburg, Pa., age 37.

DICKINSON COUNTY CHAPTER, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Spirit Lake, Iowa, April 12, 1965.

HON. ROBERT CASEY,
Member of Congress.

DEAR MR. CASEY: In an article before me your opening remarks in introducing H.R. 5641 and H.R. 5642 began as follows:

"Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress to stop the harassment of the legitimate gun owner—and instead to open war on the illegal use of firearms by the criminal preying on society."

Those words, Mr. CASEY, should live in history along with Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death."

Your further remarks, relative to the two bills, were equally pertinent and revealing. If your postal privilege permits, it is hoped you will send a copy of your introductory speech, for these bills, to every voter in the United States. At least, sir, provide a copy to every newspaper publisher; so much truth, so succinctly stated should be spread, the land over.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY PURDY, Secretary.

FARQUHAR'S HARDWARE,

Fort Covington, N.Y., April 14, 1965.
Representative ROBERT CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: My hat is off to you. In the 30 years that I have been a small retailer and a shooting enthusiast your H.R. 5642 is the first sane approach to the misuse of guns. I am writing my Congressman to support your bill.

Respectfully,

Approved For Release 2004/05/05 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500280021-4

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Burlington, Vt., April 13, 1965.

HON. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I greatly appreciate receiving your letter of March 18 enclosing a copy of House bill 5642 introduced on March 2.

I am very glad to receive a copy of the bill which I think is the most sensible suggested yet. As you have stated, it hits the person who needs to be hit and releases the sportsman of the concern that has been in mind whenever antifirearms bills are introduced in the Congress, State legislatures, or on the local level.

I have been trying to spread the word in my outdoor column and also on my television show over our local station.

Sincerely,
EDWARD A. KEENAN,
Outdoor Editor.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Lafayette, Ind., March 22, 1965.

HON. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: Thank you for sending me a copy of your bill relative to a Federal penalty for carrying a gun while committing a major crime.

In my opinion you have an excellent approach to a serious and growing national problem, and I wish you success with it. This bill, if enacted, should have far-reaching benefits. I find that there is a great deal of confusion in the public mind relative to the firearms threat. We do not wish to restrict the lawful pursuit of such field sports as hunting. On the other hand, I think it is most unfortunate that a national organization like the National Rifle Association is taking a stand against any kind of firearms legislation in the States—such as necessary laws against carrying loaded guns in cars and the requirement for casing or breaking down guns in cars. These are safety measures and they are necessary to give law enforcement officers a chance to curb poaching and unauthorized shooting on private lands. The NRA killed a loaded-gun law in this State in the recent legislative session. Eventually they cannot profit by this ill-advised activity.

I say this as one who has studied and written on hunting problems for 30 years.

With best wishes in your endeavors.
Sincerely,

DURWARD L. ALLEN,
Professor of Wildlife Management.

THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Glenview, Ill., March 22, 1965.

HON. BOB CASEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: I have been urging the National Rifle Association to support a firearms bill which would include a mandatory life sentence for anyone using a gun in the commission of a crime and for anyone previously convicted of a felony who is captured while in the possession of a gun.

Naturally, I realize this is probably more than could be achieved in Congress.

Your H.R. 5642 is thus well in line with my thinking and we shall do all possible to support it. Some comments on it will be made in the May issue of the Izaak Walton magazine. Wish it could be done sooner but the April issue is already printed.

With best wishes, I am,
Very truly yours,
WILLIAM A. RIASKI,
Executive Director.

TRADE, IN BALANCE?

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his re-

set. I wish to make my position crystal clear. I adamantly oppose any move to further reduce the duty-free allowance from \$100 to \$50.

That we have a balance-of-payments problem is a fact that all Americans are cognizant of, but we must be sure that we do not confuse our terms. This country is suffering from a balance-of-payments problem which is entirely different from a balance-of-trade problem. We have a favorable balance of trade, however, this balance is constantly infringed upon until it is completely eroded to a deficit in the payments balance. Our country has assumed the very expensive position as free world provider and defender, but is it not time to call on our allies to share this burden?

This constant call to sacrifice and to sacrifice again, that is echoed continually to our citizens, has engendered the belief in our leaders and the leaders of our allies that this call to sacrifice shall remain a constant.

I disagree; I call for a revamping of policy. Our people have worked hard, have been taxed, have exhibited an unheard of generosity; let us not reduce the chicken that laid the "golden egg" to an embittered and cynical mass of citizenry. This will be the predictable result if we continue to squeeze the flexibility of our citizens. We must reaffirm the position that Americans have the right to travel and to enjoy the artifacts of travel.

The restriction that is sought must be recognized for what it is; purely a psychological weapon which will have no true material effect on the balance of payments. The reduction in payments will be minimal. A curtailing of the rights of travel is an abridgement of a fundamental privilege which all Americans can hold dear.

People to people contact, the education of travel, must not become prohibitive. Should not our Government encourage travel? Certainly this is an issue that must be met and decided in the affirmative.

In addition to the above facts, the proposed reduction will manifest itself in a myriad of incongruous results. Congress enacted similar legislation in 1961 reducing the duty-free allowance from \$500 to the present \$100. Examination of the facts must result in the conclusion that an additional cut is meaningless. The 1961 cut brought no reduction either in the number of Americans traveling abroad or the amounts they spent; to the contrary, both figures have risen sharply.

I have constantly called for the substitution of trade for aid. This substitution will improve our relations with countries as they assume the role of trade partner in lieu of recipient. The result of the reduction will be that Americans will spend more on entertainment and services abroad than on the articles of trade. This reduction thus has the unique distinction of hampering our relations with various countries surrounding us. There is also the acute possibility that other countries will react by enacting similar reductions which will surely aggravate our balance-of-payment prob-